UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,148	05/03/2006	Minerva Yeung	42P21742	8839

8791   7590   08/04/2009
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER
OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/578,148	YEUNG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL N. OPSASNICK	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 April 2009*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 May 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Heckerman et al

(6260011).

As per claim 1, Heckerman et al (6260011) teaches a text-speech mapping method

(abstract) comprising:

obtaining silence segments for incoming speech data (as obtaining silence segments for

speech data – abstract, col. 11 lines 25-47); preprocessing incoming transcript data, wherein the

transcript data comprises a written document of the speech data (as processing input text files –

fig. 6, subblock 10 to 604); finding possible candidate sentence endpoints based on the silence

segments (as recognizing endpoints and time stamps - Fig. 6, subblock 406); selecting a best

match sentence endpoint based on a forced alignment score (as globally aligning the text – Fig.

6, subblock 607); setting a next sentence to begin immediately after the sentence endpoint (as

marking end of sentence using the silence information – col. 11 lines 25-37); and repeating the

finding, selecting and setting processes until all sentences for the incoming speech data are

mapped (and repeating until sound and text are synchronized and aligned – fig. 6, subblock

610,612, and fig. 11).

As per claim 2, Heckerman et al (6260011) The method of claim 1, wherein the

preprocessing incoming transcript data comprises:

scanning the transcript data; separating the scanned transcript data into sentences; and

placing each word from the scanned transcript data into a dictionary, if the word is not already in

the dictionary (as scanning text into text files and stored in the text corpus -- Fig. 6, subblock 10

and 604)

As per claim 3, Heckerman et al (6260011) teaches the method of claim 2, wherein each

word in the dictionary includes information on the pronunciation and phoneme of the word (as

containing phone information – col. 9 lines 34-46, as well as pronunciation information - col. 9

lines 55-65 and context -- col. 10 lines 21-26).

As per claim 4, Heckerman et al (6260011) teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the

finding possible candidate sentence endpoints based on the silence segments comprises: using a

dictionary as a table to map words and tri-phonemes for the transcript data (as stored acoustic

data in the form of subphonemes - col. 9 lines 35-55, wherein triphone are well known in the

art); generating an acoustic model for the speech data, wherein the acoustic model records

acoustic features of each tri-phoneme for words in the speech data (as triphoneme – col. 9 lines

45-55, and col. 10 lines 44-48); and determining the similarity of the transcript data features

obtained from the dictionary with the acoustic model features using a voice engine to find the

possible candidate sentence endpoints (as using time stamps to mark endpoints – col. 10 lines 55-

62 and col. 11 lines 25-37).

As per claim 5, Heckerman et al (6260011) teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the

voice engine is a HMM (Hidden Markov Model) voice engine (as HMM being one of the

probability calculations disclosed – col. 9 lines 23-33 -- HMM is a well known voice engine

recognition model).

As per claim 6, Heckerman et al (6260011) teaches the method of claim 1, wherein upon

completion of mapping each sentence, the method further comprises: obtaining silence segments

for each mapped sentence, the method further including determining word level mapping for

each mapped sentence, wherein the word level mapping comprises finding possible candidate

word endpoints based on the silence segments; selecting a best match word endpoint based on a

forced alignment score; setting a next word to begin immediately after, the word endpoint; and

repeating the finding, selecting and setting processes until all words for the for the mapped

sentence are mapped (as continual mapping of words including time stamps to recognize end of

word, as well as end of sentence, col. 10 line 47 – col. 11 line 37; col. 11 lines 50-65, col. 12

lines 53-65).

As per claim 7, Heckerman et al (6260011) teaches the method of claim 1, wherein voice

activity detection is used to obtain silence segments for incoming speech data (as detecting

silence – col. 4 lines 13-15).

As per claim 8, Heckerman et al (6260011) teaches the method of claim 1, wherein a

forced alignment process is used to find possible candidate sentence endpoints based on the

silence segments, wherein the forced alignment process further includes selecting

the best match sentence endpoint based on the forced alignment score (as when using alignment,

choosing the best score – col. 4 lines 50-65, col. 8 lines 25-45)..

Claims 9-23 are system, tool, apparatus, and article claims that perform method steps that

are similar in scope and content of claims 1-8 and therefore, are rejected under similar rationale

as presented above against method claim 1-8. Furthermore, as per claims 9-10, Heckerman et al

(6260011) teaches a front end receiver – fig. 6, subblock 20, fig. 3, subblock 312,316 as well as a

voice engine – fig. 3, subblock 312). As per claims 11-13, Heckerman et al (6260011) also

teaches a front end receiver –Fig. 3, subblock 3120, text preprocessor (Fig. 3, subblock 302),

voice activity (speech recognizer – fig. 3 subblock 312 in conjunction with silence recognition

col. 4 lines 13-20), and a forced alignment mechanism (Fig. 3, subblock 318). As per claims 14-

23, Heckerman et al (6260011) teaches text-speech mapping (Fig. 3, subblock 318) and machine

readable medium (Fig. 2, subblocks 122, 127,131).

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/15/2009 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. As per applicants arguments against the reference not teaching alignment based on a

forced alignment score, examiner disagrees and argues that Heckerman et al (6260011) teaches

forced alignment score in the global alignment based on the best match (as globally aligning the

text – Fig. 6, subblock 607, and associated text) .

Conclusion

4.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (571)272-7623,

who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

      If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mr. Richemond Dorvil, can be reached at (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

      Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Michael N. Opsasnick/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626
7/31/09